DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 781 CG 018 066

TITLE	Jail Removal Cost Study. Volume 1.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Champaign. Community Research Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquent Prevention (Dept. of Justice), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	May 82
GRANT	82-JS-AX-0004
NOTE	35p.; For volume 2 of this study, see CE 018 067.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; *Cost Estimates; *Delinquency
IDENTIFIERS	Deinstitutionalization (of Delinquents); Impact Studies; *Jails; *Juvenile Justice

ABSTRACT

This report presents a summary of the findings of a study conducted to examine the costs, experiences, and ramifications of removing children from adult jails and lockups. The approach used to conduct the study during a 6-month period (December, 1981-May, 1982) combined a mailed survey questionnaire to access state level information, and a detailed interview survey process to determine the cost and ramifications of jail removal efforts in selected local/regional areas which have either eliminated the jailing of juveniles, or were implementing a plan to effect complete removal as required by Congress. The structure of the report reflects the multiple information sources used to estimate jail removal costs and ramifications. The integrated findings and recommendations have been compiled through the use of the cost models on program operations, the 50 state surveys, and information on the actual experiences of the jurisdictions participating in the OJJDP Jail Removal Initiative. The discussion is organized under the three major topics mandated by Congress: (1) likely costs associated with implementing removal requirements; (2) experiences of jurisdictions which currently require the removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups; and (3) ramifications which may result from the removal requirement. Within each major topic, results are presented in terms of the source of information (e.g., whether the results are from the state surveys, the experiences of jurisdictions currently requiring removal, or the cost analysis and models of currently operating alternatives). Next, a set of conclusions drawn from the results is detailed. Finally, three recommendations following the last set of conclusions are presented. (MCF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

ED254781

Jail Removal Cost Study

Volume 1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CG 018066

JAIL REMOVAL COST STUDY

VOLUME I

This document was prepared by the Community Research Center of the University of Illinois under grant number 82-JS-AX-0004 awarded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

May, 1982

FOREWORD

The Jail Removal Cost Study is an examination of costs, experiences and ramifications of removing children from adult jails and lockups. This study was prepared by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention on the instruction of Congress as set forth at Section 17 of the Juvenile Justice Amendments of 1980 (P.L. 96-509).

Congress, in providing for the study, placed emphasis on the development of an estimate of costs likely to be incurred by states in removing juveniles from adult jails and lockups. The origin of this interest was the addition to the provisions of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of a requirement that such action be undertaken in the states.

Generally, data collected preparatory to formulation of this report indicated that the cost of jail removal is a function of the policy decisions made by a jurisdiction in proceeding to its implementation: a decision to place all juveniles currently housed in adult jails and lockups in secure detention will result in one cost figure while a decision to place juveniles in one of several less restricting,non-institutional options will create another set of costs. A mix of secure placements and less restrictive options creates still a third cost figure. The basis for developing a precise national figure for removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups is not available. Many jurisdictions are not in a position to provide firm cost estimates; other jurisdictions, in responding to questions concerning cost, projected removal costs for a greater number of juveniles than they reported are currently held in jails and lockups. A $118.8 million figure can be deduced by totaling the cost figures provided by respondents to the survey of states concerning jail removal. This figure is based on response to questions concerning costs from 60% of the jurisdictions surveyed.

Nonetheless, the impact of cost can be assessed from hypothetical estimations drawn on data developed in the course of the study:

-- Jurisdiction A places 100% of a caseload of 100 in secure detention for an average length of stay of 10 days. Given an average cost of $69.74 per bed per day, placement of these 100 juveniles in secure detention for 10 days will cost $69,740. (Note: excludes capital construction costs.)

-- Jurisdiction B places 100% of a caseload of 100 in a less restrictive residential option for an average length of stay of 10 days. Given an average cost of $66.68 per bed per day, placement of these 100 juveniles in a less restrictive residential option will cost $66,680.

-- Jurisdiction C returns 100% of a caseload of 100 to the community under supervision with such supervision continuing for an average of 10 days. Given an average cost of $22.17 per juvenile per day, return of 100 juveniles to the community under supervision will cost $22,170.

Any mix of the above alternatives will have obvious consequences with respect to removal costs. A fourth hypothetical features a mix of alternatives; assumes the return of a large percentage of youth to their homes under varying degrees of supervision; and reflects a one time administrative cost associated with juveniles who are returned home after initial contact.

-- Jurisdiction D distributes a caseload of 100 juveniles among four alternatives:

- 10% of the caseload (10 juveniles) are placed in secure detention for an average length of stay of 10 days. Given an average cost of $69.74 per bed per day, placement of these 10 juveniles in secure detention will cost $6,974.

- 20% of the caseload (20 juveniles) are placed in a less restrictive residential option for an average length of stay of 10 days. Given an average cost of $66.68 per bed per day, placement of these 20 juveniles in a less restrictive residential option will cost $13,336.

- Eight percent of the caseload (8 juveniles) were returned to the community under supervision with such supervision continuing for an average of 10 days. Given an average cost of $22.17 per juvenile per day, return of 8 juveniles to the community under supervision will cost $1,174.

- 62% of the caseload (62 juveniles) are returned to the community having been the recipient of administrative services only. Given a one time cost of $71 per juvenile for such administrative services, return of 62 juveniles to the community will cost $4,402.

The total cost to Jurisdiction D of utilizing a range of alternatives in providing services to a caseload of 100 juveniles is $26,486.

The Jail Removal Cost Study provides an important perspective on the costs and other ramifications of removing juveniles from adult jails and lockups, this perspective and the considerable information gathered in the course of the study's preparation will be useful to the states and their local units of government as planning tools in their efforts to move forward in this area.

June 8, 1982

VOLUME 1

SUMMARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF METHODOLOGY

Congressional Mandate. 1
Organizations Conducting the Study 2
Methodology. 3
Structure of Report. 5

LIKELY COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH REMOVAL

Results from the Cost Models 6
Results from the State Surveys 9
Characteristics of Juvenile Justice Population 10
Results from Removal Experiences 11
Conclusions about Removal Costs. 14

EXPERIENCES OF JURISDICTIONS WHICH CURRENTLY REQUIRE REMOVAL

Obstacles to Removal 17
Time Required to Plan for Removal. 17
Components of the Removal Plan (Selected Alternatives) . . . 18
Time Required to Implement Removal Plan. 18
Monitoring of the Removal Plan 19
Widening the Net Issues. 19
Conclusions about Removal Experiences. 20

POSSIBLE ADVERSE RAMIFICATIONS OF REMOVAL

Experienced Ramifications. 22
Perceived Ramifications. 22
Conclusions about Potential Ramifications. 23

RECOMMENDATIONS. 24

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

The principal amendment contained in the 1980 reauthorization to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act mandated that those states and territories participating in the legislation must remove juveniles from adult jails and lockups by 1985.

To provide additional insight on the costs and ramifications of this mandate, Congress instructed the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention as follows:

> The Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, shall submit a report to the Congress relating to the cost and implications of any requirement added to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 which would mandate the removal of juveniles from adults in all jails and lockups.
>
> (b) The report required in subsection (a) shall include--
>
> (1) an estimate of the costs likely to be incurred by the States in implementing the requirement specified in subsection (a);
> (2) an analysis of the experience of States which currently require the removal of juveniles from adults in all jails and lockups;
> (3) an analysis of possible adverse ramifications which may result from such requirement of removal, including an analysis of whether such requirement would lead to an expansion of the residential capacity of secure detention facilities and secure correctional facilities for juveniles, thus resulting in a net increase in the total number of juveniles detained or confined in such facilities; and
> (4) recommendations for such legislative or administrative action as the Administrator considers appropriate.*

Major tasks in the performance of the study were conducted by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Community Research Center, the Institute for Economic and Policy Studies and the National Criminal Justice Association in conjunction with the State Criminal Justice Councils.

---

*The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 as amended through December 8, 1980, Public Law 93-415.

This approach enabled OJJDP to present findings and recommendations to Congress and incorporate significant jail removal efforts already underway at the local, state and federal level. The approach recognized that no single source was adequate to address the complex issues of jail removal in the available period of time. Each group was used to capitalize on areas of proven expertise and past experience:

-- The Community Research Center has conducted extensive research on the issues of juveniles in adult jails and lockups since 1978. This research includes inquiries regarding the rate of suicide by juveniles in various confinement facilities, the effects of national standards release/detention criteria, and advanced practices for the planning and design of juvenile residential environments. The Center has provided technical assistance on the jail removal issue to over 100 state and local agencies and currently serves as National Program Coordinator to 17 jurisdictions participating in the OJJDP Jail Removal Initiative.

-- The Institute for Economic and Policy Studies has expertise in the areas of cost analysis, program modeling and policy recommendations. During the past decade, IEPS has conducted a wide range of cost studies related to the criminal justice system at the state and local level. The cost analysis of the LEAA Corrections Standards has direct applicability to their responsibilities under the jail removal and cost study.

-- The involvement of the states in conjunction with the National Criminal Justice Association was viewed from the outset as a critical element, if the study was to be completed within the six month timeframe. The sound and long-standing relationship which NCJA maintains with the State Criminal Justice Councils provided the only realistic conduit for developing the state-by-state profiles required by Congress. Equally important was the deep knowledge concerning the varied national efforts to achieve jail removal (i.e., National Coalition for Jail Reform).

The approach used to conduct the jail removal cost study during the six-month period (December, 1981-May, 1982) combined a mailed survey questionnaire to access state level information and a detailed interview survey process to determine the cost and ramifications of jail removal efforts in selected local/regional areas, which have either eliminated the jailing of juveniles, or were implementing a plan to effect complete removal as required by Congress.

The general flow of the study progressed through five steps each requiring careful integration and coordination of activities by the three organizations, the State Criminal Justice Councils, and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

1. Identify cost estimates of states to implement the Jail Removal Amendment.

   -- Survey development and pretest.
   -- Survey distribution and administration.
   -- Survey receipt.
   -- Data processing and analysis.

2. Determine cost models of currently operating alternatives to adult jails and lockups.

   -- Data collection.
   -- Analysis.

3. Determine local/regional experiences with jail removal. Information is largely based upon experiences of four jurisdictions involved in the Jail Removal Initiative (JRI) begun in 1980 by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. The Initiative involves two phases, planning for removal (Phase I) and implementation of removal plans (Phase II). Currently, the four jurisdictions have completed Phase I and are involved in Phase II.

   -- Identify and select five jurisdictions where jail removal has been accomplished.
   -- Identify and describe range of alternative programs and services in each jurisdiction and their costs.
   -- Identify and describe obstacles in each jurisdiction.
   -- Review jurisdictional experience to give perspective to the state survey.

4. Compile adverse and positive ramifications of jail removal identified in the state and JRI jurisdiction assessments.

5. Provide a basis for legislative and administrative recommendations for future activities regarding removal.

6. Review Jail Removal Cost Study findings and recommendations with State Criminal Justice Councils and State Advisory Groups at the 1982 OJJDP Regional Workshops.

The approach to the study provided numerous benefits in terms of extracting the best available data, assuring more realistic recommendations, and familiarizing the states with the difficulty of collection of current information and planning for jail removal. The presentation of findings and recommendations at the May Workshops continued the impetus for state and local action on the Amendment.

The Jail Removal Cost Study was not without significant limitations. The short timeframe, for instance, was a serious handicap to the efforts of the states to examine the extent of the problem in their states, collect reliable data, formulate well-reasoned estimates of cost and ramifications, and determine a comprehensive plan of action. Equally constraining was the limited availability and quality of data at the state level regarding the use of adult jails and lockups. Certain of these data deficiencies will be, for the most part, eliminated by the 1982 compliance monitoring regulation requiring 12-month statewide data; it nonetheless was a serious problem in completion of the Cost Study. These areas will continue to be important state and local technical assistance needs.

Caution in uses of the data includes: state differences in terms of definitions of the juvenile justice population, methods of assembling data, time periods covered in the data, and availability of data items. Also, the various reporting mechanisms utilized by the states did not facilitate the rendering of adequate distinctions between a person placed once in an adult jail or lockup from those persons placed more than once during a reporting period. Given these limitations, particular caution should be exercised in the use of the data provided for purposes of generalizing to a larger population; references to individual state reports are preferable to relying on aggregated data (see Appendix A).

The structure of the report reflects the multiple information sources used to estimate jail removal costs and ramifications. The integrated findings and recommendations have been compiled through the use of the cost models on program operations, the 50 state surveys, and the actual experiences from the jurisdictions participating in the OJJDP Jail Removal Initiative. From these integrated sources of data will flow information on the effects of jail removal, conclusions, and recommendations for legislative and administrative action.

Sections of the report include:

Volume 1--Summary

Volume 2--Jail Removal Cost Study

Chapter I--Introduction and Methodology
Chapter II--Cost Models
Chapter III--State Survey Results
Chapter IV--Removal Experiences
Chapter V--Potential Adverse Ramifications
Chapter VI--Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Volume 3--Appendix Materials

RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Below, the discussion is organized under the three major topics mandated by Congress: (1) likely costs associated with implementing removal requirements; (2) experiences of jurisdictions which currently require the removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups; and (3) ramifications which may result from the removal requirement. Within each major topic, results are presented in terms of the source of information (e.g., whether the results are from the state surveys, the experiences of jurisdictions currently requiring removal, or the cost analysis and models of currently operating alternatives). Next, a set of conclusions drawn from the results is detailed. Finally, recommendations follow the last set of conclusions.

LIKELY COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH IMPLEMENTING THE JAIL REMOVAL REQUIREMENT

Results from the Cost Models

Chapter II, Cost Models, is the most definitive chapter regarding the costs of implementing removal. In it, a range of actual operating costs for currently existing secure and nonsecure alternatives to adult jails is presented. The cost model has four purposes:

-- to identify and describe alternative policy areas for the placement of currently jailed juveniles;

-- to provide model cost data on these various alternatives;

-- to illustrate the potential cost impact of different policy decisions;

-- to provide planning information for states and localities to use in formulating their own removal plans.

The technology used here is one developed for the Standards and Goals Project and most extensively applied with respect to community-based programs. This sample budget methodology was used to derive comprehensive program and expenditure data for halfway houses complying with NAC standards. The procedure involves analysis of the expenditures, staffing, and program operations of a selected sample of providers, and standardizing the data to provide a "picture" of a prototypical operation. The sample budget methodology is a technique which yields accurate and complete programmatic and cost information for service-providing organizations. The program structures and budgets of actual organizations provide the foundation for the analysis. While no single organization may be capable of serving as a "model" provider, detailed examination and analysis of a collective of providers permits such information to be developed. Thus, accuracy and completeness are assured because ongoing programs provide the foundation of the analysis, yet do not constrain it.

The costs of alternatives are grouped in Table EX1 under the three policy choices available to decision-makers faced with removing juveniles from jails: secure detention, community residential care, and community supervision. Within each policy choice area, various alternative programs may be grouped. The three policy areas include the following program alternatives:

1. Secure detention--secure juvenile facilities; secure holdover (state or locally operated); pre- or post-adjudication.

2. Community residential care--group homes; shelter care; attention homes; group foster care (public or privately operated, pre- or post-adjudication).

3. Community supervision--home detention (commonly used with intensive supervision); probation; individualized foster care.

The primary characteristics that distinguish each of these three alternative policy areas are as follows: secure detention emphasizes a secure setting as a major feature; community residential programs emphasize a less secure placement, typically within a group living arrangement; community supervision emphasizes individualized care for a juvenile within his/her own home or a surrogate home (e.g., foster care). From a cost perspective, secure detention offers the most costly alternative due to the facility requirements that are necessary. Community residential care will also include the cost of housing in order to provide services, whereas community supervision programs assume the housing is already in existence and, therefore, not a cost factor. Staffing, which is the second most significant cost factor after facility costs, will vary widely among, as well as between, the three alternatives delineated. The sample used to develop the cost models consisted of budget and expenditure data collected from over 100 local service providers.

The analysis of the programs in the sample involved the following generic steps:

TABLE EX1
COST RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES TO ADULT JAILS AND LOCKUPS

Policy Choices	Low Cost	High Cost
Secure Detention[a]	$17,718	$33,194
Community Residential[b]		
Group Home	11,500	20,190
Shelter	11,396	37,276
Community Supervision		
Foster Care[c]	1,786	1,974
Therapy[d]	63.59	118.88
Intensive Foster Care[d]	50.75	83.73
Home Detention[d]	13.03	31.30

[a]Based on mean annual operating costs per bed of programs below and above the median cost.

[b]Based on minimum and maximum annual operating costs per bed.

[c]Based on minimum and maximum annual operating costs per client excluding parental stipends.

[d]Based on minimum and maximum operating costs/day of supervision.

Reference: Chapter 2, Cost Models

1. Listing and evaluating data supplied by the programs;
2. Categorizing expenditure and budget data into a standard line item format;
3. Selecting a standard budget year;
4. Selecting client and program data to be used in the analysis;
5. Determining the format in which data would be presented;
6. Identifying areas of cost variation.

The costs of alternative programs and services are influenced by several factors (see Chapter II). Chief among these factors include physical security arrangements, supervision levels, services offered, capacity and client tenure, geographical location, resource availability, auspices, and program scale.

An analysis of cost allocation for each alternative was also performed. In the analysis, operating expenditures were compared for personnel and non-personnel categories. Personnel costs included wages, salaries, and fringe benefits. Non-personnel expenditures consisted of contractual, transportation, supplies, general operating, and capital operating costs. It is notable that personnel expenditures comprised 60-90 percent of total costs of providing alternatives.

Results from the State Surveys

A large portion of states estimated the costs of removal by estimating how much it would cost to build and/or operate secure juvenile detention for the number of youths currently held in jail. Overall, of the states reporting ten or more juveniles in adult jails on a single day, 58 percent selected secure detention. For some states, the only alternative chosen was secure detention. Even for most states that chose other alternatives in addition to secure detention, costs were overwhelmingly allocated for the provision of secure detention.

On the whole, approximately 88 percent of total costs estimated by states were allocated to the building and/or use of secure detention.

The ultimate costs of removal are largely determined by which policy choices (secure detention, community residential, community supervision) are implemented. States did, in fact, estimate the dollars it would cost to provide alternatives to adult jails. Unfortunately, in many cases the methodology used by respondents to estimate costs was not clear and at times appeared inconsistent with information from the cost models, and there is some evidence (from jurisdictions that have implemented removal) to suggest that states, in responding to the survey, may have over-emphasized secure detention as an alternative. For these two reasons, plus the previously discussed limitations on generalizing from the state surveys, it is inadvisable to use the sum ($118,665,000) of states' estimates and present them as likely costs to be incurred by implementing removal.* The most effective way of using this information is on a state-by-state basis.

Examination of the characteristics of the juvenile justice population is a critical undertaking in determining what alternative programs and services are needed. Below is a summary of findings from the population data (Chapter III) supplied by 35 states. Again, the reader is advised against the aggregation and generalization of the state survey responses.

Characteristics of the Juvenile Justice Population and Utilization of Current Alternatives

The total number of juvenile arrests for a six-month period (January-June of 1981) was 476,719. Of this amount, about five percent were for serious

---

*Cost data were supplied by 30 of 35 states reporting.

delinquent offenses as defined by the JJDP Act (criminal homicide, rape, mayhem, kidnapping, aggravated assault, robbery, larceny, felonious theft, motor vehicle theft, burglary, breaking and entering, extortion with threats of violence, and felonious arson). Nearly 80 percent were for other delinquent offenses, while the remaining arrests were primarily for status and related offenses. The number of juveniles detained in adult facilities for any given day during that period was 1,778. Of those jailed, only 242 (roughly 14 percent) were reported to be serious delinquent offenders.

The distribution for the number of juveniles currently placed in existing alternatives breaks out as follows: the most widely used placements are probation, followed by foster care, state juvenile facilities, group homes, secure detention, and shelter care. The lengths of stay reported by the states reflect that placements in foster care were of the longest term (averaging 373 days), followed in declining order by probation, group homes, state juvenile facilities, shelter care, and finally secure detention (averaging 17 days).

States also reported the number of service or bedspace vacancies in alternatives. Vacancies currently exist for each of the potential alternatives except probation. In fact, the total number of vacancies on a given day exceeds the total number of juveniles to be removed from jail. One problem is, however, that alternatives are not necessarily located near the jails holding these juveniles; therefore, new placement alternatives may be required. Another problem is that the current vacancies may exist in alternatives not appropriate to serve the juveniles in jail.

Results from Removal Experiences

Currently, Jail Removal Initiative (JRI) jurisdictions have budgeted dollar amounts for the implementation of their removal plans. In contrast to the state

surveys which indicated secure detention as the primary alternative, the majority of JRI implementation monies bought various community residential or community supervision alternatives. Nonsecure programs and services comprised over 90 percent of total removal costs of the JRI jurisdictions portrayed in Chapter IV.

Planning, startup, and implementation costs associated with removal varied across all JRI jurisdictions. As indicated in Table EX2, costs of planning for removal in one jurisdiction can be as much as four times more costly than at a comparable site. Similarly, startup costs of the removal plan are widely disbursed ($2,700-$60,900). The costs of 24-hour intake also show a wide range. Table EX2 clearly indicates that removal activities in one jurisdiction can cost many times that of similar activities at another site. Additionally, personnel and non-personnel budgets are distributed similarly to the expenditures of operating programs and services found in the cost models. Personnel costs are projected to account for 60-95 percent of total operating expenses for most alternatives. However, when volunteers are used, personnel costs can comprise only 3-19 percent of total operating costs.

For different reasons, it is inappropriate to utilize JRI budget as demonstrative of actual removal costs: (1) JRI costs are projected, not actual, expenditures, and (2) because jurisdictions participating in the JRI chose to do so, they were committed to the use of less restrictive settings. The extent to which these jurisdictions are representative of other regions across the country is undetermined.

To some degree, JRI budgets indicate the extent to which administrative arrangements can affect costs of alternative placements and services. For instance, in one jurisdiction 24-hour intake coverage is performed in a five-county region on a decentralized basis (i.e., one intake worker per county). Another jurisdiction provides round-the-clock intake in a nine-county region

TABLE EX2
PLANNING, STARTUP, AND SELECTED OPERATING COSTS:
FOUR JRI JURISDICTIONS

Jurisdiction	Total Planning Costs	Time to Plan (months)	Total Startup Costs	Time to Fully Implement (months)	Intake Operating Cost (investment per child)
Alabama (SAYS)	$29,800	6	$26,100	5	$23
Arkansas (OMARR)	21,500	8	60,900	12	120
Illinois (Bolingbrook)	33,700	5	2,700	1	58
Louisiana (16th Judicial District)	86,400	7	7,000	3	32

Reference: Chapter IV, Removal Experiences.

with a centralized approach (i.e., arresting and probation officers from outlying counties call a central intake office for release/detain decisions).

In terms of operating costs, decentralized intake is projected to be about $120 per intake, while the centralized estimates range from $23 to $58 per intake. It appears, then, that centralized administrative arrangements may be more cost-effecient than a decentralized organization. However, for reasons discussed in Chapter IV, a centralized intake operation is not necessarily preferable to the decentralized approach in all jurisdictions. Unique regional characteristics may necessitate a decentralized approach as the most viable method to accomplish removal. Clearly, knowledge of a jurisdiction and its juvenile justice system is needed to accurately estimate the most viable methods, and therefore, the costs of removal.

Also illustrated in one JRI budget is the advantage of using volunteers and other donations to help defray the costs of removal. One jurisdiction estimates a need to securely detain approximately 39 youths over the next 18 months. In lieu of building new secure juvenile detention capabilities, the jurisdiction has opted to provide secure detention by way of intensive supervision. Off-duty law enforcement officers have volunteered their time to supervise children needing secure detention in a hospital unit used to detoxify juveniles. Since the average length of stay is short (2.3 days), these volunteers can provide round-the-clock supervision. As a result, the personnel outlays for the community residential program account for nine percent of the total operating budget.

Summary of Conclusions about Costs of Removal

Several inferences about the costs of removal can be drawn from the preceding information. Below, conclusions are divided into two subsets. First,

factors of removal costs are enumerated. Second, because they are directly related to the costs of removal, conclusions about the current utilization of alternatives and characteristics of the juvenile justice population are presented.

Conclusions about Removal Costs

1. Three policy choices of alternatives to adult jails can be delineated: secure detention, community residential care, community supervision. A range of alternatives exists within each policy choice. A range of cost variation exists among the alternatives.

2. How to distribute juveniles in jail among alternative policy choices is a critical decision. The key questions are: Should the child be placed in secure setting? If the child can be placed in a less secure setting, should s/he be removed from the natural home?

3. Costs of implementing removal are a function of national, state and local policy decision. It is virtually impossible to establish a final dollar figure for the cost of removal without first delineating procedures to bring about removal and establishing the need for alternative programs and services on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis.

4. Once a needs assessment is conducted and a removal plan is established, dollars required to implement removal can be estimated. The costs of removal estimated by the state surveys reflect a heavy emphasis upon the building and use of secure detention as an alternative to adult jails and lockups. The costs of removal estimated by jurisdictions which have implemented a needs assessment and a plan for removal reflect a heavy emphasis upon the use of various nonsecure alternatives.

5. Major factors that affect total cost are facility, personnel, level of services, and administrative arrangements. There are ways to defray costs through in-kind sources, e.g., by using existing facilities or staffing with volunteers. Thus, the degree to which one draws from available community resources is critical.

Conclusions about Current Utilization of Alternatives and Characteristics of the Juvenile Justice System

1. About 14 percent of jailed juveniles are held for serious offenses.

2. There are twice as many juveniles arrested for status offenses as there are for serious delinquent charges.

3. The availability of community residential type placements, i.e., group homes and shelter care, are less than that of secure detention (based on existing capacities).

4. Across the nation as a whole, vacancies exist within all of the potential alternatives (with the exception of probation).

5. There is a great deal of interest and concern about removal on the part of the states as evidenced by the level of detail provided in individual state submissions.

6. A wide population distribution exists for juveniles in adult jails and lockups. Most juveniles in jail have not committed serious crimes as defined by the JJDP Act.

7. There is little knowledge on how to distribute the jailed population among alternatives, because the characteristics of that population commonly have not yet been identified.

8. Informed decisions (policy choices) suggest the need for improved intake screening and classification of juveniles (i.e., needs assessment).

9. The states have limited experience in projecting costs of various alternatives.

EXPERIENCES OF JURISDICTIONS WHICH CURRENTLY REQUIRE REMOVAL OF JUVENILES FROM ADULT JAILS AND LOCKUPS

For this study, information regarding removal experiences is derived from two main sources: the four JRI scenarios and the Pennsylvania summary (see Chapter IV). Topics addressed include obstacles to removal, removal plan focus, time requirements to implement the removal plan, monitoring of the removal plan, and net-widening issues.

Results from the Jail Removal Initiative and Pennsylvania

Jurisdictions encountered both similar and diverse experiences with removal. It is to be expected that many removal experiences are shared by the various JRI regions since the methods used to plan for removal were basically uniform in each jurisdiction. Yet, similarities also exist between the JRI jurisdictions and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Obstacles to Removal

Common to all jurisdictions examined in Chapter IV, a core of obstacles emerged which impeded the prohibition of juvenile placement in adult secure settings. Examples of these hindrances are: a lack of locally accessible alternative programs and services (including transportation), a lack of specific release/detain criteria (i.e., objective intake screening), physical/geographical problems such as lengthy travel times and distances between the site of custody and the nearest juvenile placement alternative, and state statutes which allow law enforcement the authority to detain youth predispositionally in adult jails. There are also economic obstacles evidenced by small tax bases and a low priority given to the issue of children in jail; political obstacles that often occur when several counties pool efforts and resources together in a cooperative removal plan; and perceptual differences regarding the type and scale of alternatives needed (for example, secure detention perceived as the single-solution alternative to adult jail).

The process of conducting a needs assessment helped overcome some obstacles such as the lack of intake criteria, and the perceptual pre-disposition toward secure detention. Other obstacles were surmounted by identifying and implementing alternatives needed by the juvenile justice population or by enlisting the support of key local leaders. Currently, JRI sites have established work-plans by which to progress toward the resolution of obstacles not yet overcome.

Time Required to Plan for Removal

JRI regions required varying amounts of time (4-8 months) to develop a plan for removal. The two most time-variant steps in plan development were data collection for the needs assessment and the establishment of policy and procedures for various components of the removal plan.

Components of the Removal Plan (Selected Alternatives)

The jurisdictions utilized a variety of alternatives as components of their removal plans. No two JRI sites implemented the same networks of alternative programs and services. However, just as a core of obstacles emerged from each of the scenarios, so did a core of alternative programs and services. Components of the removal plan which comprise the core include: (1) 24-hour intake screening; (2) some provision for secure detention (including intensive supervision); (3) at least one community residential program; (4) at least one community supervision program or service; and (5) transportation services. Specific alternatives provided by the four JRI sites, in order of their frequency of occurrence, were: 24-hour intake, transportation, various community supervision services, foster and shelter care, and secure detention or intensive supervision. Significantly, little or no need was identified for secure detention. In two jurisdictions, intensive supervision was provided in lieu of secure detention. In Pennsylvania, the funding mechanism discouraged the building of secure detention centers.

Time Required to Implement Removal Plan

Varying amounts of time were required to operationalize the components of the removal plan. Jurisdictions were able to implement some programs and services within a few weeks after funding commenced (December, 1981-February, 1982). Other alternatives are not yet operational. It is anticipated that full implementation of the removal plans will require from 3-12 months.

Pennsylvania accomplished complete removal over a five-year period. Clearly, statewide initiatives may require more time. JRI jurisdictions, which are single and multi-county regions, are smaller than states. A state's size (and

broader jurisdiction) may make the process of removal more complex than at the regional or county level. The increased complexity for states may manifest itself by having a larger number of actors involved or a greater need for cooperation and coordination among juvenile justice practitioners. Undoubtedly, the degree of complexity of state and local juvenile justice systems has an impact upon both the process by which to plan for removal as well as the strategy, costs, and schedule by which to implement removal.

Monitoring of the Removal Plan

Each JRI jurisdiction has developed a method by which to monitor the removal plan. The monitoring function is usually performed by intake staff as a normal part of their duties. In Pennsylvania, monitoring occurs by on-site inspection and the use of a hotline through which reports of juveniles in jail can be received.

Widening the Net Issues

Pennsylvania has not experienced a net increase in the total number of juveniles detained in secure settings. In fact, the number of securely detained juveniles in the Commonwealth has been reduced 38 percent since 1974 (12,697-8,289).

JRI sites project a substantial decrease in the number of juveniles securely detained. Of juveniles held in adult jails prior to removal, only 7-25 percent will require secure detention after implementation of removal plans. This finding is consistent with past assessment efforts in Oklahoma and Louisiana.

Conversely, JRI jurisdictions project an increase in the number of juveniles entering nonsecure juvenile placements. It is estimated that approximately 3-17 percent of juvenile intakes will be placed in nonsecure settings

that previously were not available. While the nonsecure placement increases might be viewed as "widening the net," one must bear in mind that, according to specific criteria, a portion of the juvenile population showed a legitimate demand for these services. Although a lack of services sometimes results in returning a child to the natural home, these data indicate that return to home is not always an adequate response by the justice system to the needs of the youth population.

Moreover, JRI participants project that between 50-100 percent of arrested juveniles are to receive previously unoffered intake services. Of these intakes, 7-28 percent are estimated to receive various community supervision services that, heretofore, were also unavailable.

Summary of Conclusions about Experiences of Removal

The preceeding information indicates that removal was accomplished by varying means in each of the five locations reviewed (the four JRI jurisdictions and Pennsylvania). Enumerated below are inferences drawn from the experiences of removal contained in Chapter IV.

Conclusions about Removal Experiences

1. Jurisdictions experience a core of obstacles to removal including a lack of alternatives; a lack of objective intake screening; a lack of transportation services; physical/geographical problems; legal and political hindrances; and perceptual orientations which heavily emphasize the need for secure detention.

2. Jurisdictions demonstrate the need to plan for the removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups.

3. Jurisdictions demonstrate a need for financial and technical assistance to plan for and implement alternatives.

4. Without assistance, jurisdictions indicate little knowledge regarding varying strategies to accomplish removal.

5. Jurisdictions which have implemented a plan for removal are offering nonsecure programs and services that are tailored to the entire juvenile justice population, not solely for "kids in jails".

6. Jurisdictions which have implemented removal have required varying amounts of time and money to plan for removal.

7. Jurisdictions which have implemented a plan for removal have utilized a variety of alternatives to accomplish removal.

8. Jurisdictions which have implemented a plan for removal indicate that secure detention is a small part of the desired alternatives after conducting a needs assessment.

9. Jurisdictions which have implemented removal have required varying amounts of time and money to operationalize alternative programs and services.

10. Jurisdictions which have implemented a removal plan have developed methods to monitor that plan and juveniles who continue to be placed in jail.

11. Jurisdictions which have implemented a plan for removal via assessed needs have not experienced a net increase in the number of secure detained juveniles.

12. Jurisdictions developed a core of alternatives including 24-hour intake and transportation services, secure detention, a community residential program, and a community supervision program or service.

13. To accomplish removal, jurisdictions have required changes in policies and procedures regarding law enforcement apprehension, intake screening, methods of referral, and contact with the juvenile court.

14. Jail removal plans are unique to each jurisdiction, but one common theme abounds: removal can be achieved within a large variety of action plans which develop a network of programs and services responsive to the needs of the juvenile justice population.

POSSIBLE ADVERSE RAMIFICATIONS OF REMOVAL

This part of the report (Chapter V) addresses possible ramifications resulting from removal. Data are compiled from Pennsylvania, state survey respondants, and JRI jurisdictional personnel. It is interesting that some

potential ramifications perceived by the states and the JRI sites were actually observed in Pennsylvania. However, with these data it cannot be determined if the experiences of Pennsylvania are necessarily attributable to removal. Below, experienced ramifications in Pennsylvania are presented, followed by perceptions of state survey respondants and JRI jurisdictional personnel.

Experienced Ramifications

As noted in the section on removal experiences, Pennsylvania did not experience a net increase in the number of juveniles securely detained. In fact, the rate of juvenile incarceration has decreased 38 percent since 1974. Over the past three years, there seems to be a slight increase in the number of waivers to adult court. However, four years ago there were more waivers than last year (402 in 1977, 371 in 1980). Therefore, it is inconclusive whether removal is linked to an increased number of juveniles tried as adults. Other changes observed in Pennsylvania include:

-- a decrease in the overall time spent by juveniles in the justice system;

-- an increase in the time that juveniles are held in secure settings;

-- an increase in the use of private service providers, non-system alternatives, and nonsecure alternatives.

Perceived Ramifications

Both states and JRI sites were queried about possible ramifications associated with the removal requirement. Although individual states varied in their projections of future impact of the removal requirement, most states agreed that they expected the following to be associated with removal:

-- a decrease in the rate of juvenile incarceration;

-- no change in the number of waivers to adult court;

-- an increase in overall time spent in the juvenile justice system;

-- an increase in the use of private providers;

-- an increase in the need for administrative resources;

-- an increase in the use of non-system alternatives;

-- an increase in the use of nonsecure alternatives;

-- no change or an increase in negative community perceptions about juvenile justice.

Like the states, individual JRI jurisdictions also differed in projected ramifications of the removal requirement. Those areas of impact in which JRI sites tended to concur included:

-- a 0-10 percent decrease in the rate of juvenile incarceration;

-- no change in the number of waivers to adult court;

-- a decrease in overall time spent in the juvenile justice system;

-- an increase in the use of private providers;

-- an increase in the need for administrative resources;

-- an increase in the use of non-system alternatives;

-- an increase in the use of nonsecure alternatives;

-- a decrease in negative community perceptions about juvenile justice.

Both states and JRI jurisdictions were asked to identify their primary source of information in making their projections about possible ramifications of removal. Expert opinion by juvenile justice practitioners was the main information source. Only eight states noted that their information was based upon planning studies (including master plans, impact projects, etc.).

Conclusions about Potential Ramifications

Although at the present time there is little empirical evidence concerning the ramifications of removal, the following has been deduced from this study:

1. Jurisdictions have different perspectives about the potential effects and ramifications of jail removal.

2. Jurisdictions which have implemented a plan for removal are not experiencing a net increase in secure detention for juveniles. On the other hand, states surveyed tended to select secure detention as the preferred alternative.

3. Possible adverse ramifications include an increase in the number of waivers to adult court and an increase in the length of time in juvenile detention centers (based on Pennsylvania).

4. More juveniles than those who are now placed in adult jails are likely to receive services after removal is implemented. Yet, it is likely that the number of securely detained juveniles will not increase if a needs assessment is conducted.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As mentioned previously, numerous factors bear upon the effort to remove juveniles from adult jails and lockups. Evidence accumulated during the conduct of this study makes it clear that total removal will be accomplished as a product of state and local public interest and support; recognition and identification of the difficulties and responsibilities involved at each level; the increasing dissemination of technology and information regarding alternative courses of action; and, lastly but most critically, the willingness of commitment to the long-term effort that will necessarily be required.

For these reasons, the following recommendations are presented as a means of working toward achievement of removal as a public goal.

1. State and local jurisdictions should provide for the identification of the juvenile populations served and the potential for utilizing various alternative programs and services for this population (as determined on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis).

It has been noted that many states feel that the development of secure juvenile facilities is necessary in order to close jails to juveniles, however, experience demonstrates that this need not be the case. Despite federal emphasis

on nonsecure possibilities for many years, numerous states and localities still regard juvenile detention facilities as the primary alternative. It would appear that, all efforts to the contrary, information is not getting through to all the states and that attitudes regarding alternatives and their use are changing only slowly in some areas. Current information and technology dissemination methods should ensure coverage of all constituency groups of the juvenile justice system.

In those jurisdictions which have received direct federal assistance and funding, removal efforts are characterized by a willingness to explore nonsecure community residential and community supervision programs and services. These alternatives can be less costly than secure, facility-based programs in terms of both capital and operational expenditure. The point remains that when states and localities examine juvenile justice systems,the process seems to result in a reduced reliance on secure placement options, and consequently, a potentially reduced removal cost.

2. In order to make informed policy choices, a number of questions must be asked through a conscientious planning process. This planning process will help (1) ensure the most applicable and reasonable allocation of available funds toward the removal of juveniles from adult jails; (2) minimize the costs associated with removal wherever possible to overcome potential resistance due to monetary constraints; and (3) promote the availability of a range of programs and services which meet the needs of the juvenile justice population. States and localities should pursue a plan for removal and conduct a planning process on a state-by-state basis as the foundation for necessary and definitive system change.

Given the conclusions set forth previously in this report, it is incumbent upon state and local authorities to establish a uniform process where existing conditions and needs for alternatives services in each jurisdiction can be investigated, described and analyzed. Such analysis should be performed by

each state according to some consistent format. How to distribute juveniles in jail among alternative policy choices is a critical decision. The key questions are: Should the child be placed in a secure setting? If the child can be placed in a less secure setting, should s/he be removed from the natural home?

This process should include, but not necessarily be limited to, such items as:

A. Clear, uniform guidelines regarding state and local roles and responsibilities pursuant to the planning and implementation effort;

B. Well-defined problem identification, target population, and projected goals for the planning effort;

C. Inventory of all existing programs and services available to the juvenile justice system within each state and its jurisdictions;

D. Assessment of policies and procedures which have bearing upon out-of-home placements for juveniles;

E. Procedures of information analysis, specifically in the areas of intake screening and decision-making, actual placements and programs, programmatic costs, length of time in the juvenile justice system, current availability of alternatives, and legal procedures (due process);

F. Identification of needed transportation services and new alternatives based on information discovered (including information regarding concepts of programs, policies, and procedures), and economic consequences;

G. Method of continued monitoring of juveniles held in jail.

It is anticipated that planning at this scale will only be possible by following a uniform process capable of some degree of flexibility to accommodate changing situations in each state.

Necessary to this effort will be the development of objective intake screening criteria by each jurisdiction. Information obtained during the

planning process can be weighed against these criteria to project the need for alternative services, more detailed removal costs, and the need for specific technical expertise and/or funding assistance. The specific criteria and the planning process should reduce the states' emphasis on secure juvenile detention and promote the perspective which considers secure detention as one alternative among many others.

The state and local removal effort should be aimed at providing a core of alternative programs and services to alleviate the use of adult jails and lockups. The core should include 24-hour intake screening, transportation services, secure and nonsecure residential programs, and supervised release to the home. State removal plans should include:

A. The development of a flexible network of service and placement options based upon the principle of selecting the least restrictive setting and maintaining family and community ties;

B. A planning, needs assessment, and implementation process which affords juveniles all due process requirements and involves citizen and professional participation;

C. The development and adoption of court intake criteria, consistent with nationally recommended standards for alleged juvenile offenders and non-offenders who are awaiting court appearance;

D. The development of services which resolve problems of juveniles in a non-judicial manner, including the coordination of public and private child welfare and juvenile justice services.

This planning and implementation process should distribute juveniles currently jailed into the most appropriate alternative policy choices, and consequently, provide a viable and flexible removal plan.

3. Congress should anticipate flexibility in the target date of full implementation of state plans (December 8, 1985).

The accomplishment of removal requires concentrated effort on the part of state and local agencies. The experiences of Pennsylvania and the JRI jurisdictions indicate that unique circumstances require a variety of actions, procedures and time requirements to implement removal.

Some jurisdictions are closer to removal than others. For instance, one state may currently be conducting a needs assessment while another may remain basically uninformed about the extent that jails are utilized for juveniles or the characteristics of the juvenile justice population. Therefore, it may be unrealistic to expect that all states can adequately plan for and fully implement removal in the time allotted by the Act. It should be anticipated that special circumstances may necessitate a longer period of time for some states.

*U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1982 0-361-233/1006